

Cady Guyton
Annotation #6
The Persuaders
690 words

1. Title, director and release year?

The Persuaders is a Frontline PBS documentary or "film for action" that was released in 2005.

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central argument of the film was to draw attention to and dissect the world of advertising and the psychology that is now inherently part of the profession.

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

A series of interviews are conducted in order to establish the framework of advertising and "cult-brands." The central story is that of the creation of "Song Airlines" where the way of life/attitude being sold supersedes the actual product itself. In its most striking instance, the film outlines the application of "Song" as an adjective, something, or some individual, being "So-Song."

4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out? Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational? Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?

"The Persuaders" outlines the psychology behind advertising as a way to perpetuate the consumer culture that has created such advertising giants. The same sort of selling of things being the most valuable, contributes to the throw-away culture always in need of the latest model, the newest edition, and earliest release. Quick turn overs of products increases waste making it environmentally unsustainable. This sort of behavior is of course unsustainable in a pursuit of "life, liberty, and happiness" because as inherently social beings, humans don't achieve happiness through things, thus perpetuating the search for more and the greater production of waste in the process.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and/or compelling? Why?

Most compelling was the series of interviews by professionals in the industry. In particular the titles of the positions that are held by these people carry a scary psychological component of manipulation behind advertising today. In order to best due this, the film creates emotional play because the very topic of discussion becomes an emotional one that creates the chemical and psychological components necessary in order to manufacture a need or a desire.

6. What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?

"The Song Story" is the behind the scenes puppetry that goes into creating an emotional connection with a brand, however I think the film lacked details on the reactions of customers and the economic success of *Song Airlines*. It effectively detailed the efforts of creating the brand and training the employees to sell it, but it failed to give much context of the airline within its industry.

7. *What audience does the film best address? Why?*

"The Persuaders" is most likely aimed at the American consumer. It details the manufacture of a need/life style as opposed to a specific product. It is also of course relevant within the advertising industry; however I'm inclined to believe that that audience does not need the film in order to understand this particular niche of advertising. Thus, it best addresses the consumer, particularly by only detailing the creation of Song as a positive, continuing to sell the brand.

8. *What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental education value?*

As a film that focuses more on some of the other aspects of sustainability (i.e. organizational, cultural, information and media), environmental education could have been enhanced by more directly illustrating the environmental concerns that are linked to consumer culture, capitalism and competition, and luxurious global travel, all of which are largely being perpetuated by Song airline as directly outlined within The Persuaders.

9. *What kind of actions and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.*

Serving as more of an informational and slightly promotional film of Song Airline by Delta, the film doesn't offer any corrective action, as it doesn't really outline any of the situations as a *problem*, per say, but rather as a sort of clever branch off, showcasing Song more of a personalized brand creation as opposed to the psychological branding that is its end goal. Corrective action to this problem? New advertising laws could perhaps alleviate the pressures that companies put on consumers. Of course consumers can/should be more aware of how these companies are organized, and how their advertising style targets certain value systems. Unfortunately awareness of the problem alone would most likely not adequately equip the consumer against psychological advertising.

10. *What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references.)*

Having never heard of Song Airline prior to this film, the first thing I did was a cursory google search the brand, upon which, I found that Song only existed from 2003 to 2006. With this snapshot view on the brand, I looked into articles on its conception, its ultimate failure, and the promotional videos that created during that three year window of operation.

Song Airlines Promotional Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nJYPvBnhz8A>

Song Airlines Case

<http://www.123helpme.com/song-airlines-case-view.asp?id=167341>

Song Airlines—the crash of an ideal concept

<http://unblogdemarketing.com/historias-de-exitos-y-fracasos/song-airlines-the-crash-of-an-ideal-concept/>

Cady Guyton
Annotation #7
Fresh
598 words

1. Title, director and release year?

Fresh was released in 2009, and directed by Ania Sofia Joanes.

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central argument of the film is one of organic and sustainable farming practices as an alternative, and solution to, big business and industrial architecture. Fresh pays careful attention to displaying the advantages of these sustainable farms to animals, farmers, and consumers alike.

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The narrative is made and sustained by on-location filming at these farms, detailed interviews with and shadowing of the farmers that run the farms. The narrative comes full circle with intermittent interviews and scenes of farmers that are subsidized by various companies and the industrial farming techniques used by the majority of the industry. Ultimately, the film interviews a "convert" farmer who was trained in business and bought into the big ag mentality, only to suffer extensive sickness with his livestock and ultimately himself, turning him on to sustainable, organic, farming.

4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out? Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational? Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?

The film centers on the unsustainable health aspects of big agriculture, showcasing the unsanitary conditions in farms and the antibiotics necessary to keep animals sick that are simultaneously cultivating drug resistant bacteria. From that, the viewer sees the culture that has perpetuated the realization of big agriculture, the capitalist mentality that allows it to continue, and the economic unsustainability realized by constant exploitation of people, land, and animals. The media does little to expose the problem, chain grocery stores maintain the questionable organization of the entire food industry, the food within our very education system does little to educate the masses on food sources and healthy living. Environmentally, industrial agriculture is fundamentally wrong within the ecological system and the symbiosis that requires diversity and cooperation in order to survive. All of these points are brought up directly, or hinted at within the film.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and/or compelling? Why?

The interviews with the farmers, on their farms, were by far the most compelling scenes of the film for me. Not only, the beautiful farms, and happy, healthy farmers of the small scale, clearly invested in their work, their animals, and their land, but also the interviews with the farmers under big agriculture, who have accepted it as their reality and see no way out from under the thumb of the corporation without a major turn-over or financial investment on their part.

6. *What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?*

I am perhaps least compelled by aspects of economic feasibility of switching, as a consumer, from industrialized food production to organic sustainable small scale food production. However, I realize that my reality as a college student provides a skewed perspective on food budgets.

7. *What audiences does the film best address? Why?*

The audience best addresses the average consumer in order to question the mentality of what "cheap" food really costs at the grocery store. This is central to their argument for change that where the consumer spends their dollar, speaks volumes and is the best way to fight the larger support systems of government subsidies.

8. *What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental education value?*

The film could have included more scenes shot on location in the reality of industrial food processing in order to expose the mechanical separation between human and animal in large-scale farming operations. I.e. Dairy Farm, Cattle Farm, etc.

9. *What kind of actions and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.*

The film mostly suggests spending your money on food that comes from the type of farming initiatives that best supports humans, animals, and lands. The top-down approach would be to intervene on legislation with the goal to change which foods and farming processes are government subsidized.

10. *What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references.)*

The end of the film plugs the website that supports the grassroots movements spurred by the Fresh movie. It led me to look into the creation of the movie and "The Movement" that supports organic and sustainable farming, and the local proliferation of said movement.

<http://www.freshthemovie.com/>

<http://www.renscotourism.com/Details.aspx?sid=8e1fbd1a-5818-4d5b-9db4-3a6003302921>

Cady Guyton
Annotation #8
In Transition 2.0
383 words

1. Title, director and release year?

In Transition 2.0 is a 2013 documentary, it was created by a host of individuals including Emma Goude (Green Lane Films), Emilio Mula, Becca Strong, and Rebecca Mayes

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central argument of the film is a catalog of how "Transition groups" around the world are responding to various global crises ranging from energy to economics, to the environment.

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The film is a compilation of various scenes conducted in an array of "transitional neighborhoods" around the world, largely focusing on the successful local experiments around the United Kingdom. The most "radical" of locations have established a local currency and fully localized their economy to keep the money within the neighborhood(s).

4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out? Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational? Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?

Most apparently, the film illustrates a host of economically unsustainable practices that largely deplete the wealth present within local, small scale settings. The hosts of problems that supplement this economic unsustainability are all political, legal, cultural, technological; media and informational (advertising), and cultural organizations that create an efficient urban organization that destroy locally sustainable communities.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and/or compelling? Why?

Most compelling to me was the success of local currency within communities. Skeptical of the ability for local currencies to succeed; I was happy to see it functioning.

6. What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?

I am unconvinced by the ability to proliferate transition movements around the world. The vast majority of cases shown in the film were of communities within Europe and the UK.

7. What audiences does the film best address? Why?

The audience most likely aims for younger, more liberal audiences. It most adequately targets those that would be most likely to support grassroots movements, as are the types of supports that fuel transition movements.

8. *What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental education value?*

If they exist, a wider variety of locations with success transition movements would further prove the ability for transition movements to succeed in a variety of locations and situations.

9. *What kind of actions and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.*

In Transition 2.0 essentially suggests that those that have it in them, should come together, rally, and act on their desires for change. A very noble desire, however, rarely does that sort of idealized initiative succeed and thrive for an extended period of time. I am happy to see grassroots fundraising making a difference in recent years.

10. *What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references.)*

The title "In Transition 2.0" led me to look into the first Transition movie. UK examples led me to search out what sort of transitions movements/initiatives and success stories may exist within the US.

Transition Movie

<https://www.transitionnetwork.org/transition-movie>

United States Examples

<http://transitionus.org/transition-town-movement>

Cady Guyton
Annotation #9
Garbage Warrior
338 words

1. Title, director and release year?

Garbage Warrior was released in 2007 and directed by Oliver Hope. It has been screened at various environmental and film festivals worldwide.

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The narrative of the film follows "eco-architect" Michael Reynolds through several of his projects, showing the genius reality of architecture off the grid.

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The argument is sustained by following architect Michael Reynolds through the construction process, realization of, and living within his "radically sustainable housing."

4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out? Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational? Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?

The film focuses on housing and the waste within a home, coupled with the energy expended by the construction industry. Both of these niches incorporate all aspects of sustainability.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and/or compelling? Why?

Most compelling was Reynolds' use of recycled and recaptured materials particularly in the use of bringing natural light into the homes. Knowing how difficult it is to remove a housing unit from the grid (particularly in the United States), yet still maintaining the modern amenities expected by first world inhabitants, it was very impressive to see the final realization of his homes.

6. What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?

I was least compelled by the organizational strategy of Reynolds' homes. The film starts with the scene of one of his projects isolated out in the southwestern desert of the United States. While perhaps a single home with nothing but open land and open sky is ideal, it is not realistic.

7. What audiences does the film best address? Why?

The audience generates the sort of "fun fact" theme of the film...while it advocates for off the grid living, it does little to suggest a way that someone may transition to sustainable living quarters.

8. What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental education value?

As stated a suggestion on how to transition to sustainable housing would easily enhance environmental education and efficacy.

9. What kind of actions and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.

Educational instillations could be implemented throughout the country, in more common place locations, in order to display the ease of living off the grid.

10. What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references.)

I was compelled to look more into Michael Reynolds and his work as well as his ideals on both the profession and how we live. I google-imaged him for work, finding that much of it is visually similar. He also maintains a blog on eco-culture, architecture, and how we live.

<http://earthship.com/blogs/author/biotecture/>

<http://www.garbagewarrior.com/>

Cady Guyton
Annotation #10
GMO - OMG
358 words

1. Title, director and release year?

GMO OMG was released in 2013 and directed by Jeremy Seifert.

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central argument of the film is one around genetically modified food and the lengths that the country is going to in order to feed ourselves. It is deemed the "largest experiment ever conducted on human beings."

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The film goes into the corporate structure that has perpetuated the realization and stabilization of genetically modified organisms that have become utterly common place in our diet.

4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out? Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational? Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?

Diving into the corporate structure, the film exposes the organizational unsustainability of the system behind the generation of genetically modified organisms. That has all established the culture that accepts these GMOs without question, the lack of education about where are food is coming from, and the media that entirely ignores the problem.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and/or compelling? Why?

Most compelling was the intensity with which the facts were presented. The scenes questioning the general public on what in fact a GMO is, and the ignorance on the subject is especially shocking.

6. What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?

I was not compelled by the informality of the film; while approachable and seemingly knowledgeable, it was very casual and interviewing the public to rally against GMOs that other parts of the public previously admitted that they didn't even know the definition of G-M-O.

7. What audiences does the film best address? Why?

The audience best addressed is the general public because the public is largely the star of the film, both to inspire motivation and exposure ignorance on the subject.

8. What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental education value?

The film could include a more formal aspect with concrete science and expert interviewing as opposed to relying almost exclusively on public opinion.

9. *What kind of actions and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.*

The film encourages the public to fight back, rise against, and “yell louder.” While that is absolutely necessary and public ignorance is condoning the problem, our national leaders must make it an individual priority to ensure that Americans diets are not being doubted by genetically modified foods. Capitalist corporate structure certainly perpetuates the problem as money seems to cloud almost all legal judgment in much of our higher (and often lower) government officials.

10. *What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references.)*

I googled the movie in order to better understand the reaction around GMO OMG, I was surprised to see the negative reception and feeling of uninformed, uninspired documentation.

<http://www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/omg-gmo-smdh>

<http://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/gmo-omg>